```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
          1
14:08:55
                                  SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
14:08:55
          2
                                    WEST PALM BEACH DIVISION
14:08:55
          3
                                 CASE NO. 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG
14:08:55
14:08:55
                      IN RE: ZANTAC (RANITIDINE)
14:08:55
          5
                      PRODUCTS LIABILITY
                                                    . West Palm Beach, FL
14:08:55
                      LITIGATION.
                                                    . May 20, 2022
14:08:55
14:08:55
14:08:55
          7
14:08:55
                                    TELEPHONIC DISCOVERY HEARING
14:08:55
14:08:55
                               BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRUCE REINHART
14:08:55
          9
                                 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14:08:55
14:08:55
         10
14:08:55
                      FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
                                            TRACY A. FINKEN, ESQ.
14:08:55
         11
                                            Anapol Weiss
14:08:55
                                            One Logan Square
14:08:55
                                            130 N. 18th Street Suite 1600
14:08:55
                                            Philadelphia, PA 19103
                                            215-735-1130
14:08:55
         13
14:08:55
14:08:55
                                            NOAH HEINZ, ESQ.
                                            Keller Lenkner LLC
14:08:55
14:08:55
         15
                                            150 N. Riverside Plaza
14:08:55
                                            Suite 4270
                                            Chicago, IL 60606
14:08:55
         16
                                            312-741-5222
14:08:55
14:08:55
         17
14:08:55
                      FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
                                            EVA CANAAN, ESQ.
14:08:55
         18
                                            King & Spalding LLP
                                            1180 Peachtree Street Suite 1600
14:08:55
14:08:55
         19
                                            Atlanta, GA 30309
                                            404-572-4600
14:08:55
14:08:55
         20
14:08:55
14:08:55
         21
                      Official Court Reporter:
                                                  Pauline A. Stipes
14:08:55
                                                  HON. ROBIN L. ROSENBERG
14:08:55
         22
                                                  West Palm Beach/Ft. Pierce FL
14:08:55
                                                  561-803-3434
         23
          24
          25
```

THE COURT: This is case number 20-02924, In Re:
Zantac (Ranitidine) Product Liability Litigation. We are here
today for a discovery hearing.

Who is appearing and who is going to speak on behalf of the Plaintiffs, please?

MR HEINZ: Noah Heinz for the Plaintiff.

MS. FINKEN: Tracy Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs. Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Who is going to be appearing on behalf of all the Defendants or just the BI Defendants? Who is appearing on behalf of the Defendants today?

MS. CANAAN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Eva Canaan for Boehringer Ingelheim and Defendants.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Canaan.

This matter is before the Court on the Defendants' expedited motion for additional time to depose Dr. McTiernan.

I had a chance to review that motion, which is now unsealed, the Plaintiffs' opposition as well, and I did not read all 800 pages of her deposition line for line, I will confess to that.

I did have a chance to review the deposition and get a feel for the deposition.

With that, I guess, Ms. Canaan, it is your motion. I did read your motion.

I will tell you what resonated with me and what didn't

10:36:52

10:36:57

10:37:01

10:37:02

10:37:03

10:37:07

10:37:09

10:37:14

10:37:15

10:37:21

10:37:18 10

10:37:22 12

10:37:24 13

10:37:26 14

10:37:31 15

10:37:32 16

10:37:33 17

10:37:36 18

10:37:40 19

10:37:46 20

10:37:52 21

10:37:55 22

10:37:56 23

1

2

3

5

7

8

10:38:10 1 10:38:14 2 10:38:19 3 10:38:26 10:38:33 5 10:38:38 6 10:38:42 10:38:47 8 10:38:47 9 10:38:54 10 MS. CANAAN: 10:38:56 11 10:38:59 12 10:39:05 13 10:39:09 14 10:39:11 15 10:39:15 16 10:39:18 17 10:39:22 18

10:39:24 19

10:39:27 20

10:39:32 22

10:39:35 23

10:39:39 24

10:39:45 25

21

10:39:32

resonate with me. The argument that the Plaintiffs' lawyer was being obstructionist didn't resonate with me. The fact that Dr. McTiernan -- I didn't find Dr. McTiernan's answers, at least the ones I observed, to be unprepared or nonpersuasive, but I am interested primarily in talking to you about the one study which she admitted she wanted to go back and take a second look at because apparently the authors had amended it.

Those are just some preliminary thoughts, Ms. Canaan. I will be happy to hear whatever topic you want to talk about.

Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, approximately two months ago we asked you for an additional five hours to depose Dr. McTiernan because she is a critical expert in this litigation and she had submitted two expert reports totaling approximately 430 pages. Your Honor allowed us this additional time given the importance of this testimony.

As we stated in the motion, the purpose of getting more time was really frustrated Dr. McTiernan's nonresponsiveness.

First of all, as you have probably seen, your Honor, Dr. McTiernan would not answer any general questions about her methodology and her response to every general question was, it really depends on the facts of a particular study, but when I did show her particular studies, and I asked about her methodology and interpretation of the results, her response was always, it is whatever I said in my reports.

10:39:48 Your Honor, these were basic methodological questions 1 10:39:52 like, are you extrapolating from a specific data in a specific 2 10:39:55 3 study that lumps, say, gastric and esophageal cancers to reach 10:40:01 conclusions about esophageal cancers specifically? This is a 10:40:03 methodology question that every epidemiologist should be able 5 10:40:07 to answer without reading their entire report. 10:40:10 7 Similarly, she would not even answer my questions 10:40:14 8

10:40:17

10:40:25

10:40:22 10

10:40:27 12

10:40:30 13

10:40:33 14

10:40:37 15

10:40:42 16

10:40:46 17

10:40:48 18

10:40:51 19

10:40:52 20

10:40:58 21

10:41:01 22

10:41:06 23

10:41:11 24

10:41:15 25

11

Similarly, she would not even answer my questions about whether she was relying on specific data for her opinion. Her response was, I am not sure what if I am relying on this, I need to see what I wrote in my report.

The Plaintiffs claim in opposition is, the Defendants should have asked questions about the report instead of her methodology. That really doesn't make sense, your Honor, because the purpose of a deposition is not for the expert to sit there and find portions of her report and read them word by word into the record. If that is the purpose of the expert deposition, then I submit, your Honor, no one would go through the trouble of taking one.

Moreover, and what is really important here, is that each Ranitidine study was discussed in 20 to 40 pages and crossed numerous different parts of two different reports totaling 430 pages. It would not even be feasible for Dr. McTiernan to review what she wrote about her study just so she could answer elementary questions like whether she was relying on particular findings or what her methodology was.

10:41:19 Secondly, Dr. McTiernan could not answer any questions 1 10:41:24 about specific studies without literally reviewing the studies, 2 10:41:27 3 the entire studies. Now, it is certainly not unreasonable, your Honor, for 10:41:28 10:41:31 a witness to take a few minutes to review something before 5 10:41:34 6 answering the question, and frankly, I questioned Plaintiffs' 10:41:37 7 other epidemiologist, Dr. Moorman, earlier this week and asked 10:41:42 8 her some of the exact same questions that I asked Dr.

10:41:44

10:41:51

10:41:47 10

10:41:54 12

10:41:57 13

10:42:04 14

10:42:07 15

10:42:10 16

10:42:15 17

10:42:17 18

10:42:19 19

10:42:23 20

10:42:34 23

10:42:40 24

10:42:44 25

21

22

10:42:27

10:42:30

9

11

McTiernan, and she was able to answer them without any problem after taking only a few minutes to review the relevant study.

For example, the same questions about whether
Ranitidine increases the risk of cancer compared to other H2
blockers were asked of Dr. Moorman, and she was able to answer
those questions without rereading every single study like Dr.
McTiernan testified.

By contrast, Dr. McTiernan would not even tell me if the study was statistically significant or not without reviewing the study methods and what the authors may or may not have said about each specific study. No other Plaintiffs' expert has done this, and there were at least five Plaintiffs' experts that have been deposed already in this litigation, not even Plaintiffs' other epidemiologist, Dr. Moorman. So, I will submit this was obviously very intentional stonewalling.

Third, your Honor asked about the Adami study. Dr. McTiernan could not answer a question about the Adami study,

which is a critical study discussed in 44 pages of her report.

After being given a 37-minute break to review the study, she came back and said that she needed to review the study after her deposition to form any opinions about the study.

She also testified that because she had not yet considered the Adami study, she could not answer any questions about her overall causation analysis for the four cancers, the liver cancer, pancreatic, stomach, and esophageal, that were addressed in the Adami study.

In other words, if I asked her any question about how she reached her overall causation opinion for any of those four cancers, the answer was, I can't tell you because the Adami study is off the table. She could not tell me how she weighed the overall evidence for any of the four cancers given that she has not considered the Adami study.

Now, Plaintiffs' opposition makes a number of very inaccurate and disingenuous claims with respect to the Adami study, your Honor. First, they claim that it was totally understandable that Dr. McTiernan was not aware of the correction to the Adami paper.

On page 11 of their opposition Plaintiffs state that the Defense experts also had not addressed the Adami correction. Now, this is simply false. Literally every single Defense expert addresses this correction and cites the correct data from the study.

10:44:19 25

10:42:50

10:44:21 1 10:44:25 2 10:44:28 3 10:44:32 10:44:36 5 10:44:38 6 10:44:42 7 10:44:45 8 10:44:48 9 10:44:52 10 10:44:57 11 10:45:00 12 10:45:05 13 10:45:09 14 10:45:15 15 10:45:19 16

10:45:22 17

10:45:26 18

10:45:30 19

10:45:31 20

10:45:41 23

10:45:43 24

10:45:47 25

21

22

10:45:35

10:45:39

Moreover, Plaintiffs' other epidemiologist, Dr.

Moorman, explicitly said in her report this was an obvious error, and she cited the correct data from the Adami study.

So, Dr. McTiernan is literally the only epidemiologist who relied on the wrong Adami data and she testified at her deposition that she purportedly read the reports of Dr. Moorman and other Defense experts.

I mention this only because I want to make clear that we had every expectation coming into this deposition that she would be able to answer these questions about the Adami study.

Secondly, Plaintiffs say, oh, the Adami paper is totally uninformative anyway. That claim is just completely contrary to Dr. McTiernan's testimony. If she thought that the Adami study was uninformative, she would have said that, right. She would have said that instead of saying that she needed to review it carefully after the deposition and that she could not answer any questions about her overall causation analysis about four out of five cancers without having considered the Adami study.

Even if her opinion today, after having considered the Adami study, is that the Adami study was, quote unquote, uninformative, as Plaintiffs represent, we certainly have a right to inquire as to the basis for that opinion and finally get some answers about her overall causation analysis that she never gave at her deposition.

And finally, Plaintiffs claim that Defendants should have reserved hours to question Dr. McTiernan after her deposition about the Adami study and her overall causation analysis for four out of five cancers, but that makes no sense because it would effectively penalize Defendants for Dr. McTiernan's lack of preparation with respect to the study and her overall causation and analysis.

10:45:50

10:45:52

10:45:57

10:46:02

10:46:05

10:46:07

10:46:13

10:46:16

10:46:19

10:46:23 10

10:46:27 11

10:46:32 12

10:46:38 13

10:46:42 14

10:46:44 15

10:46:46 16

10:46:50 17

10:46:55 18

10:47:01 19

10:47:03 20

10:47:08 21

10:47:12 22

10:47:17 23

10:47:19 24

10:47:24 25

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

Now, the bottom line, your Honor, is this: As the record stands, Dr. McTiernan could not proffer any opinions about the Adami study, and more importantly, about how she reached her overall causation analysis — her overall causation opinion, how she synthesized the totality of the data for four out of five cancers at issue. She was nonresponsive and she frustrated efforts to elicit basic information about her methodology and conclusions.

Now, Plaintiffs have said that they intend to do a two hour redirect of Dr. McTiernan. Frankly, we anticipate that during this redirect Dr. McTiernan will not ask Plaintiffs' counsel after each question to review every study in her 430-page expert report. We anticipate that she will be responsive and provide new opinions, and we, as a matter of fairness, should be allowed to followup on that new testimony.

And finally, Plaintiffs have stated on the record that this deposition would be reconvened at a mutually convenient time, mutually convenient. Instead, they have unilaterally

10:47:29 1 10:47:33 2 10:47:34 3 10:47:38 4 10:47:41 5 10:47:45 6 10:47:49 10:47:50 8 10:47:51 9 10:47:53 10 10:47:56 11 10:48:00 12 10:48:03 13 10:48:08 14

10:48:14 16 10:48:18 17 10:48:24 18

10:48:11 15

10:48:25 19 10:48:28 20

10:48:32 21

10:48:35

10:48:39 23

22

10:48:41 24

10:48:43 25

noticed it on the afternoon of the very last day of expert discovery.

Your Honor, we respectfully request that the deposition take place earlier so we have an opportunity to tee up any disputes to the Court, or to the extent that it does take place on the 31st, that there be judicial oversight of the deposition.

That is all I have, your Honor, but I'd be happy to answer any specific questions you might have.

THE COURT: I may have some in a second after I hear from the other side. Your request for additional team, do you want to question Dr. McTiernan before or after the Plaintiffs do their redirect?

MS. CANAAN: So, I think what I would do, I would ask for -- we are asking for four hours, and I would probably ask some questions before and some questions after, but it really doesn't matter for me. I am happy to only ask my questions after.

I would, frankly, defer to your Honor on when I ask the questions. It really would not matter to me, although I think I would like to ask at least some questions after the redirect because that is when I will find out what her opinions are.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CANAAN: I am thinking aloud here. In that sense,

10:48:45 1 10:48:49 2 10:48:51 3 10:48:52 4 10:48:55 5 10:48:58 10:48:59 7 10:49:03 8 10:49:06 9 10:49:11 10

10:49:15 12 10:49:17 13

11

17

10:49:14

10:49:20 14 10:49:23 15

10:49:27 16

10:49:28

10:49:30 18

10:49:38 19 10:49:41 20

10:49:45 21

10:49:48 22

10:49:55 23

10:49:58 24

10:50:00 25

it probably makes more sense for me to ask my questions after their redirect.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you personally -- obviously you are the one taking the deposition. Are you available on May 31st to take the deposition?

MS. CANAAN: Yes, I can --

THE COURT: Is your objection to the unilateral set that simply the clock may run out, you will run up against the discovery deadline, and if you need some judicial relief afterwards that your time will be up? Is that really more the concern?

MS. CANAAN: Yes, that is more of a concern, your Honor, and for that reason, if that is the last day, we are taking the deposition on the very last day, I would really appreciate if there would be some judicial presence at this deposition.

I think that would make the deposition run smoother.

I think we would probably -- we potentially could be done in less time if there was judicial oversight, and I think it would be the most efficient way to conclude this deposition, to really have someone present who could see to what extent Dr.

McTiernan answers questions from the Plaintiffs' attorneys in the same responsive manner in which she is going to answer questions from the Defense attorney.

THE COURT: Thank you. I understand your position. I

appreciate that very much.

Mr. Heinz or Ms. Finken, from the Plaintiffs, I will hear from you at this team.

MR HEINZ: This is Mr. Heinz. I will speak for awhile, and I think Ms. Finken might have some additions to make.

I want to start with the scheduling demand, and opposing counsel just confirmed she is available on May 31st, and that is actually more convenient for them than it is for us since Mr. Ronca is double booked on that day. It wasn't our preference to have it on May 31st, but Dr. McTiernan is simply not available other times.

We didn't anticipate that there would need to be a third day. That happened based on things that arose at the time, and because we were going so late on Friday night, and so we asked, and that is the only day that she has available based on other demands on her time, and there is no reason to require a rescheduling on a day she doesn't have available. That is not what happened with any other witness.

As far as the responsiveness point, it is sort of a muddled concession that the motion did not sufficiently carry this point because the only argument you heard just now is that, compared to other witness transcripts, this is different, none of which was included in the motion at all.

If we are going to talk about other witnesses, we

10:51:19 24

10:51:22 25

would have the opportunity to refer to Dr. Whitty's (phon)
deposition or Dr. Trodocker's (phon) deposition in which they
routinely consulted their report before answering over and
over, and refused to answer questions about specific studies
without reviewing the studies. What Dr. McTiernan did was in
no way unusual for an expert deposition, and if that point were
actually raised, we would be able to demonstrate that point.

And if your Honor already tentatively agreed with us on that, there is really not much more to say.

As far as the Adami study, I will say some things, and then Ms. Finken has more to say about it.

You know, the questions were very aggressive and very much indicated that there were substantial differences in the correction that would, you know, affect her conclusions in a large way, and that, understandably, made Dr. McTiernan a little bit nervous about answering on the fly right there.

If, for example, the questions had said something like, based on the version you saw, and then ask questions, they probably could have continued in that way, but, you know, there wasn't any attempt to be accommodating or to actually press on the analysis as it was in the report.

The demand was that Dr. McTiernan, during a break, familiarize herself with the correction, and that is fairly unreasonable and not the type of thing that this witness could actually do.

10:51:25

10:51:27

10:51:34

10:51:37

10:51:42

1

2

3

4

The other thing is, we did quote a section in the opposition in which Dr. McTiernan said that the study was uninformative for various reasons, and that has been her consistent position in the report as well.

The correction itself is -- well, I suppose for the correction itself I will turn it over to Ms. Finken for some additional details on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Finken.

10:53:05

10:53:07

10:53:11

10:53:16

10:53:18

10:53:24

10:53:28

10:53:31

10:53:33

10:53:39

10:53:49

10:53:56

10:53:36 10

10:53:45 12

10:54:00 15

10:54:02 16

10:54:06 17

10:54:10 18

10:54:15 19

10:54:20 20

10:54:24 21

10:54:33 23

10:54:34 24

10:54:37 25

10:54:29

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

1.3

14

MS. FINKEN: Tracy Finken on behalf of Plaintiffs.

Your Honor, I just want to point out one point.

Ms. Canaan suggested that the Defense experts had all dealt with the Adami correction, and that is just a false statement. The Adami correction was not made until March 21, 2022 online, and that is well after the Defense expert reports were served in this case.

It is no surprise that Dr. McTiernan did not pick up on the fact that there was a change to the Adami study well after her report and, you know, directly before the rebuttal reports were due. Frankly, it is not picked up on until the ends of April, and to the extent that Ms. Canaan said that the Defense experts all addressed it in their reports, it is just false. Their reports were served prior to the correction on March 21st.

So, I just needed to point that out, your Honor.

Obviously, you can take it, you know, however you want based

upon the transcript that you read, and we provided the full transcript so you could put everything into context. As I understand, the transcripts were not provided with the Defense briefing.

And you can see exactly how Dr. McTiernan answered questions. She sat for two full days, almost an entire 12 hours on the record, which equated to about 18 hours in person, and she is willing to finish her deposition on the last day of the discovery. She has grant writing responsibilities that take precedent before that for her day job, and is unavailable before the May 31st date.

So, that is all, your Honor, that I wanted to point out about the Adami study and Ms. Canaan's representations about it. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. CANAAN: Your Honor, if I --

THE COURT: Hold on, hold on, hold on. I will give you a chance to respond, Ms. Canaan.

Ms. Finken, back to you or Mr. Heinz. I don't know who is the right person to answer this.

If I understand the framework here, I haven't read any of these studies, but this is an epidemiology study that apparently Dr. McTiernan reviewed in preparing her report.

After the written reports were submitted, the authors of that study modified the study or changed the conclusions, or

10:55:45 20

10:55:56 23

10:56:00 24

10:56:05 25

21

22

10:55:47

10:55:51

something changed about it.

The question on the table, maybe this is the question Ms. Canaan was asking at the deposition and Dr. McTiernan wasn't comfortable answering was, does that change anything?

Do your opinions change based upon the fact that this underlying study has changed?

Ms. Finken or Mr. Heinz, am I correct that that is the framework that Dr. McTiernan is working under as we go forward?

MS. FINKEN: Noah, did you want to respond or would you like me to?

MR HEINZ: I can respond.

THE COURT: Let me expand on that further. It would seem to me, if I am taking the deposition maybe the first question I ask Dr. McTiernan is, having now reviewed the Adami study, do you want to change or modify any of the conclusions in your report? Has Dr. McTiernan come to a conclusion about how she is going to answer that question?

If the answer to that question is no, then maybe Ms. Canaan doesn't have a whole lot else to do, or maybe now Dr. McTiernan is much more comfortable answering some of the questions that she wasn't comfortable answering. If the answer to that question is yes, then we may have to go in a different direction.

I am just curious if I am even looking at the question the right way.

10:56:08

10:56:10

10:56:13

10:56:16

10:56:19

10:56:22

10:56:24

10:56:29

10:56:36

10:56:42

10:56:46

10:56:49

10:56:40 10

10:56:43 12

10:56:53 15

10:56:59 16

10:57:03 17

10:57:04 18

10:57:06 19

10:57:11 20

10:57:14 21

10:57:19 22

10:57:23 23

10:57:24 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

13

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, I can respond to that. The bottom line is that the Adami corrections will not change Dr. McTiernan's conclusions in her report.

However, to the extent that Ms. Canaan has very specific questions about the data -- because what happened when they corrected the Adami study is, they changed the tables with the relative risks and the consonant intervals and all of that were changed, and it deals with -- you know, there are multiple analyses and sub analyses that that deals with.

So, Dr. McTiernan was not comfortable answering specific questions on the fly about the data that was changed in the tables.

However, ultimately -- and she did, I believe, state this on the record and I don't have a reference for you, and I apologize, your Honor. We could supplement it if we need to. The Adami study was so flawed and had so many limitations with the way that it was conducted that Dr. McTiernan gave it very little weight in her analysis regardless.

The changing of the data tables does not change the limitations of the flaws in that study. She will stand by the limitations and the flaws in that study and her conclusions are not going to change.

To the extent that she needs to answer very specific questions about specific data points in that study, that is something that, in all fairness, she should have been given the

10:58:42 24

10:58:46 25

10:58:48 opportunity to thoroughly review and evaluate and factor that 1 10:58:52 into her analysis, but it is not going to change her ultimate 2 10:58:55 3 conclusions because the limitations of the study have not 10:58:59 changed, and that he is something that is well thought out and 10:59:01 5 10:59:04 6 7

them.

articulated in her report. She has testified to that extent on the record regarding the limitations of all of these -- some of these studies that she gave very little weight to, Adami being one of

And if your Honor is going to indulge Ms. Canaan and grant her additional time besides the 11 minutes that they reserved to question Dr. McTiernan about it, I do not anticipate that it should be extensive questioning at all because, as your Honor has aptly pointed out, it will not change her conclusions in this matter.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Finken.

Mr. Heinz, was there anything else you wanted to add before I go back to Ms. Canaan?

MR HEINZ: Just one final point, which is that a big part of having a long deposition in which a number of questions can be asked is to get out things that can be used to impeach the witness or to question credibility, and to the extent they want to make that point about the Adami study, they have already asked the questions and they can add more later, but they had an opportunity to ask questions about it, and the fact

10:59:06 10:59:09 8 10:59:15 10:59:16 10 10:59:19 11 10:59:23 12 10:59:29 13 10:59:32 14 10:59:34 15 10:59:37 16 10:59:39 17 10:59:42 18 10:59:45 19 10:59:49 20 10:59:53 21 10:59:56 22 11:00:01 23

11:00:04 24

11:00:07 25

11:00:10 1 11:00:15 2 11:00:19 3 11:00:21 11:00:23 5 11:00:27 6 11:00:28 11:00:30 11:00:33 11:00:34 10 11:00:39 11 11:00:43 12 11:00:46 13 11:00:51 14 11:00:56 15 11:01:00 16 11:01:04 17 11:01:09 18 11:01:15 19 11:01:18 20 11:01:24 21

11:01:27 22

11:01:30 23

11:01:32 24

11:01:32 25

that they didn't like the answer shouldn't allow them to demand her read it and then ask four more hours of questions on the same topic.

THE COURT: Thank you. From the Plaintiffs' side, you anticipate about two hours of your questioning? I am not going to hold you to a specific number, but you are anticipating about two hours?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor, Tracy Finken again on behalf of Plaintiffs.

That is what we estimate the max it would be, would be two hours. I think on the record at the tail end of the deposition we had anticipated it would be about an hour and a half of questioning on our behalf, and at that point in time they had reserved 11 minutes of their 12 hours.

We don't -- just in an abundance of caution, we have set aside two hours for us to question, and that is why, you know, we anticipated this not being too much of an issue on May 31st, despite Mr. Ronca being double booked. We are trying to make arrangements to have him still be able take Dr. McTiernan's testimony and subbing somebody else in for the other deposition that he was slated to take that day.

So, we are working around it, but we think approximately two hours max.

THE COURT: Thank you. Let me hear from Ms. Canaan.
Ms. Canaan.

MS. CANAAN: Thank you, your Honor, a few things.

First of all, Ms. Finken mentioned that the official correction to the Adami paper was issued in mid March. That is correct, however, there was a preprint with the correct data. That corrected data appears in all Defense expert reports, and in Dr. Moorman's report.

I showed Dr. McTiernan Dr. Moorman's report at her deposition where Dr. Moorman specifically said there was an obvious error in the Adami paper, this was the error, and then she cites the exactly correct risk estimates, so I wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Heinz said that somehow Dr. McTiernan testified that the Adami study was uninformative. That is just not true. I don't think she ever testified that the study was uninformative. She literally said she can't answer any questions about it. If she thought the study was uninformative, she would have said it doesn't change anything for me, and then she would have answered my questions about how did you consider the overall data on esophageal cancer, how did you consider the overall data on liver cancer.

She would not answer any of those questions. She said, I can't answer any question that asks me about overall data for specific cancers because the Adami study is off the table.

So, in addition, this is the critical piece, because

11:01:36

11:01:37

11:01:40

11:01:43

11:01:46

11:01:54

11:01:56

11:02:01

11:02:04

11:02:08 10

11:02:13 11

11:02:14 12

11:02:19 13

11:02:25 14

11:02:26 15

11:02:28 16

11:02:31 17

11:02:36 18

11:02:38 19

11:02:43 20

11:02:45 21

11:02:45 22

11:02:50 23

11:02:55 24

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

11:02:59 1 11:03:04 2 11:03:07 3 11:03:11 11:03:15 5 11:03:19 11:03:22 7 11:03:29 8 11:03:31 11:03:36 10 11:03:40 11 11:03:46 12 11:03:53 13 11:03:55 14 11:03:59 15 11:04:03 16 11:04:09 17 11:04:14 18 11:04:16 19 11:04:19 20 11:04:21 21

11:04:24 22

11:04:28 23

11:04:34 24

11:04:36 25

she couldn't formulate an opinion about the Adami study, she couldn't answer any questions about how she weighed the data and how she reached her overall causation conclusion about four out of five cancers at issue in this litigation because those four cancers are addressed in the Adami study.

Then your Honor raised the question, well, what if her opinion now is, nothing in the Adami paper changes my conclusion? We need time to explore that. Literally, if increased risks in the version that she reviewed are now decreased risks or no risk, shouldn't we have an opportunity to ask the expert why? When increased risk becomes decreased risk or no risk, why does your opinion not change? Right?

Again, not only are we talking about the Adami study, but why does it not change in the overall causation analysis that you are doing under Bradford Hill where one of the critical criteria in her causation analysis is consistency?

Well, if the data is not consistent, how are you reaching your opinion, and how are you weighing the evidence now that you have had a chance to review the Adami study and form opinions about it?

So, again, I really want to emphasize that this is not just about the Adami study, it is also, and really more importantly, about her overall causation opinions about four out of five cancers.

When I asked her questions at the deposition like

let's look at the overall evidence for esophageal cancer, she cut those questions short and said, I can't answer because I haven't considered the Adami study.

Now for her to come in and say the Adami report does not change anything, you don't have to ask me any questions about anything, including my causation analyses, that would be really significantly prejudicing the Defendants' ability to find out what her opinions are before trial.

Finally, Plaintiffs said it is going to be two hours, or one and a half hours, or whatever it is going to be for the redirect of Dr. McTiernan. Again, the critical point here is that the two hours that they are going to get with Dr. McTiernan, I expected she will be responsive, she will not filibuster, she will not say, I have to spend hours reading my reports. She is going to be responsive to their questions, she is not going to say, I don't recall.

So, it is not an equivalent amount of time that the Defense would need to elicit her opinion. That is the only point I was trying to make, and again, for that reason, I think judicial oversight of the deposition would really help move things along and speed things along in this deposition.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Okay, let me take these in no particular order.

First of all, I am not going to preside over the

11:05:59 25

11:06:02 1 11:06:07 2 11:06:11 3 11:06:16 11:06:17 5 11:06:21 6 11:06:26 7 11:06:30 8 11:06:35 11:06:42 10 11:06:46 11 11:06:48 12 11:06:48 13 11:06:51 14 11:06:55 15 11:06:58 16 11:07:01 17 11:07:05 18 11:07:11 19 11:07:14 20 11:07:17 21

11:07:20

11:07:24 23

11:07:28 24

11:07:31 25

22

deposition. I think judicial oversight should be reserved for the rarest of circumstances when -- and this is not one of them, so I am not going to preside over the deposition. That is first of all.

Second of all, look, to the extent Dr. McTiernan is unable to explain her methodology, or is taking inconsistent positions, or is unwilling to commit to certain things change, those are wonderful arguments that the Defense can make to Judge Rosenberg at the Daubert hearing as to why Dr. McTiernan should not be given any credibility, if that is they argument they want to make, but I don't know that you are entitled to ask her all those questions when you have already had 12 hours, and you didn't reserve any time for that.

So, I am going to give Defense a little bit of extra time because I do believe, to the extent Dr. McTiernan was asked unobjectionable questions about particular conclusions or particular methodologies and she declined to answer them because she felt she needed to review some data, I don't criticize her for that. I wouldn't want to answer any question if I wasn't a hundred percent sure.

But to the extent those questions were asked, there should be some leeway to allow the Defense to come back and say, now that you have reviewed the Adami study, and now that you are more familiar with the data, let's talk about your conclusions on four of the five cancers, etc. etc.

I think there should be some leeway there.

Here is what I am going to do. I am going to order --I am going to give the Defense one extra hour which they can use after the Plaintiffs have done their redirect. if you start at 3:00 o'clock on the 31st, you will be done by 6:00 o'clock.

If for some reason -- I don't anticipate this, if there is some reason thereafter for a party to come to the Court and say, hey, we need to reopen the deposition, or we need more time, even though the discovery deadline has run out, this one very unique setting requires further review, I don't think in the two plus years we have had this case that Judge Rosenberg or I have ever refused to at least consider a request like that. If it is well founded, we will consider it.

That will be the order of the Court today. I am going to grant the motion in part and deny the motion in part. will grant the Defendants one extra hour to depose Dr. McTiernan, and that additional time can be taken after the Plaintiffs have completed their redirect examination.

The deposition will occur on the 31st of May at 3:00 p.m., and the Court declines the invitation to preside over the deposition in real time.

With that, let me turn to Defense. Not waiving any objections you may have to the rulings I just made, is there any clarifications you need or any other issues that you

11:08:50 25

11:07:36

11:07:39

11:07:40

11:07:44

11:07:46

11:07:50

11:07:51

11:07:54

11:07:59

11:08:03 10

11:08:07 11

11:08:12 12

11:08:15 13

11:08:18 14

11:08:22 15

11:08:24 16

11:08:27 17

11:08:30 18

11:08:35 19

11:08:40 20

11:08:42 21

11:08:47 22

11:08:50 23

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

11:08:54 1 11:09:00 2 11:09:00 3 11:09:04 11:09:04 5 11:09:08 11:09:10 7 11:09:13 8 11:09:17 9 11:09:19 10 11:09:20 11 11:09:20 12 11:09:22 13 11:09:24 14 11:09:25 15 11:09:32 16 11:09:36 17 11:09:41 18 11:09:43 19 11:09:46 20 11:09:50 21 11:09:53 22 11:09:55 23

11:10:01 24

11:10:02 25

thought you would raise that I need to rule on?

MS. CANAAN: No, your Honor. We just wanted to clarify that we have an additional one hour; is that right?

THE COURT: Right. Not one hour and eleven minutes, it's and additional 49 minutes I am giving you.

MS. CANAAN: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Finken or Mr. Heinz, not waiving any objections yo may have to my rulings, any other issues or any clarifications you are seeking?

MS. FINKEN: Your Honor --

MR HEINZ: One --

MS. FINKEN: Sorry, go ahead, Noah. I have a question as well.

MR HEINZ: One clarification. The rationale, as I understood it, was to allow questions related to the Adami study and the answers she was not able to give based on the Adami study. Is the additional hour of questions limited in scope to that subject area?

THE COURT: No, I am not going to be that granular.

Ms. Canaan seems very adamant that she needs to ask those questions. If she then chooses not to ask those questions, then that is her choice, bit I am not going to micromanage the questions that can be asked.

MR HEINZ: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Finken, you have something else you

11:10:04 wanted to clarify? 1 11:10:05 MS. FINKEN: Mr. Heinz was anticipating my question. 2 11:10:08 3 I had the same question, if the 49 minutes of additional time 11:10:12 4 was limited in scope to questions about Adami that she was 11:10:17 5 unable to answer at the last deposition, or if she could ask 11:10:21 whatever she wants during those 49 extra minutes. That was the 11:10:25 7 crux of my question. 11:10:26 THE COURT: To make it clear, she can ask whatever she 11:10:30 9 wants to ask during that additional period. 11:10:33 10 All right, everybody, thank you very much. We will do 11:10:35 11 an order memorializing the rulings I just made. I will thank 11:10:40 12 the parties, wish everyone a good weekend, and I will excuse 11:10:44 13 you. 11:10:45 14 (Thereupon, the hearing concluded.) 11:10:47 15 11:10:47 16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 11:10:47 17 from the record of proceedings in the above matter. 11:10:47 18 11:10:47 19 Date: May 25, 2022 /s/ Pauline A. Stipes, Official Federal Reporter 11:10:47 20 11:10:47 21 Signature of Court Reporter 22 23 24 25

analysis [11] 6/7 7/17 7/24 561-803-3434 [1] 1/22 8/4 8/7 8/11 12/21 16/18 MR HEINZ: [7] 2/5 11/3 17/2 20/14 20/16 15/10 17/18 24/10 24/13 **60606 [1]** 1/16 **Anapol [1]** 1/11 24/23 6:00 o'clock [1] 23/6 answer [29] MS. CANAAN: [10] 2/12 3/9 **answered [2]** 14/5 19/18 9/13 9/24 10/5 10/11 14/15 **answering [7]** 5/6 12/3 12/16 18/25 24/1 24/5 800 [1] 2/19 15/4 15/20 15/21 16/10 MS. FINKEN: [8] 2/6 13/8 **answers [4]** 3/3 7/24 10/22 15/8 15/25 18/7 24/9 24/11 24/16 25/1 ability [1] 21/7 anticipate [6] 8/17 8/20 **THE COURT: [21]** 1/22 2/8 **able [7]** 4/5 5/9 5/13 7/10 11/13 17/13 18/5 23/7 2/14 9/9 9/23 10/2 10/6 12/7 18/19 24/16 **anticipated [2]** 18/12 18/17 10/24 13/7 14/14 14/16 15/11 about [57] **anticipating [2]** 18/6 25/2 17/15 18/3 18/23 21/22 24/3 above [1] 25/17 any [30] 24/6 24/18 24/24 25/7 anything [5] 15/4 17/17 abundance [1] 18/15 accommodating [1] 12/20 19/17 21/5 21/6 actually [4] 11/9 12/7 12/20 anyway [1] 7/12 /s [1] 25/20 12/25 apologize [1] 16/15 **adamant [1]** 24/20 3/7 14/23 apparently [2] Adami [46] appearing [3] 2/4 2/10 2/11 02924 [1] 2/1 add [2] 17/17 17/24 appears [1] 19/5 **addition [1]** 19/25 appreciate [2] 10/15 11/1 additional [12] 2/17 3/11 **approximately [3]** 3/11 3/14 **11 [3]** 6/21 17/11 18/14 3/15 9/11 13/7 17/11 23/18 18/23 **1130 [1]** 1/13 24/3 24/5 24/17 25/3 25/9 April [1] 13/20 **1180 [1]** 1/18 additions [1] 17/14 11/5 aptly [1] **12 [3]** 14/6 18/14 22/12 addressed [4] 6/9 6/22 13/21 are [27] **130 [1]** 1/12 20/5 area [1] 24/18 **150 [1]** 1/15 **argument [3]** 3/1 11/22 22/10 addresses [1] 6/24 **1600 [2]** 1/12 1/18 arguments [1] 22/8 admitted [1] 3/6 **18 [1]** 14/7 11/14 affect [1] 12/14 arose [1] **18th [1]** 1/12 **after [18]** 5/10 6/2 6/3 7/16 **around [1]** 18/22 **19103 [1]** 1/12 7/20 8/2 8/19 9/10 9/12 9/16 arrangements [1] 18/19 9/18 9/21 10/1 13/14 13/18 articulated [1] 17/5 **as [19]** 2/19 3/16 3/19 7/22 14/24 23/4 23/18 **20 [2]** 1/5 4/20 **afternoon** [5] 2/8 2/9 2/13 7/23 8/8 8/21 11/20 11/20 **20-02924 [1]** 2/1 2/15 9/1 12/10 12/10 12/21 13/4 14/2 20-md-02924-ROSENBERG [1] **afterwards** [1] 10/10 15/8 17/14 22/9 24/13 24/14 1/3 again [5] 18/8 20/13 20/21 **aside** [1] 18/16 **2022 [3]** 1/5 13/13 25/19 21/11 21/19 ask [19] 8/18 9/14 9/15 9/17 **21 [1]** 13/13 **against** [1] 10/8 9/19 9/21 10/1 12/18 15/14 **215-735-1130 [1]** 1/13 **aggressive** [1] 12/12 17/25 18/2 20/11 21/5 22/12 **21st [1]** 13/23 ago [1] 3/11 24/20 24/21 25/5 25/8 25/9 **25** [1] 25/19 **agreed [1]** 12/8 **asked [15]** 3/11 3/23 4/12 **ahead** [1] 24/12 5/7 5/8 5/13 5/24 6/10 11/16 **all [19]** 2/10 2/19 3/19 9/8 17/21 17/24 20/25 22/16 **30309 [1]** 1/19 11/24 13/11 13/21 14/12 16/7 22/21 24/23 **312-741-5222 [1]** 1/16 16/25 17/7 17/13 19/2 19/5 asking [2] 9/15 15/3 **31st [8]** 9/6 10/5 11/8 11/11 21/25 22/4 22/5 22/12 25/10 **asks** [1] 19/22 14/11 18/18 23/5 23/20 **allow [3]** 18/1 22/22 24/15 **Atlanta [1]** 1/19 **3434 [1]** 1/22 **allowed [2]** 3/14 8/22 **attempt** [1] 12/20 **37-minute** [1] 6/2 **almost** [1] 14/6 **attorney** [1] 10/24 **3:00 o'clock [1]** 23/5 along [2] 21/21 21/21 **attorneys** [1] 10/22 **3:00 p.m [1]** 23/21 **aloud** [1] 9/25 **authors** [3] 3/7 5/18 14/24 **already [4]** 5/21 12/8 17/24 **available** [5] 10/4 11/8 22/12 11/12 11/16 11/18 **40 [1]** 4/20 **also [3]** 6/5 6/22 20/22 **aware [1]** 6/19 **404-572-4600 [1]** 1/19 **although [1]** 9/20 **awhile** [1] 11/5 **4270 [1]** 1/15 **always** [1] 3/25 **430 [2]** 3/14 4/22 **am [20]** 3/5 4/9 4/9 9/17 **430-page [1]** 8/20 9/25 15/7 15/13 15/24 15/24 back [5] 3/6 6/3 14/19 17/18 **44 [1]** 6/1 18/5 21/25 22/3 22/14 23/2 22/22 4600 [1] 1/19 based [6] 23/2 23/3 23/15 24/5 24/19 11/14 11/16 12/18 **49 [3]** 24/5 25/3 25/6 24/22 13/25 15/5 24/16 amended [1] 3/7basic [2] 4/1 8/14 **amount** [1] 21/17 basis [1] 7/23 **5222 [1]** 1/16 **analyses [3]** 16/9 16/9 21/6 be [39]

В	changing [1] 16/19	criticize [1] 22/19
<u> </u>		
BEACH [3] 1/2 1/5 1/22	Chicago [1] 1/16	crossed [1] 4/21
	choice [1] 24/22	crux [1] 25/7
Beach/Ft [1] 1/22	_ = =	
because [19] 3/7 3/12 4/14	chooses [1] 24/21	curious [1] 15/24
	circumstances [1] 22/2	cut [1] 21/2
6/5 6/12 7/8 8/5 9/22 11/15		
11/22 16/5 17/3 17/14 19/23	cited [1] 7/3	5
	cites [2] 6/24 19/10	D
19/25 20/4 21/2 22/15 22/18		
	claim [4] 4/11 6/18 7/12 8/1	data [19] 4/2 4/8 6/25 7/3
becomes [1] 20/11	claims [1] 6/17	7/5 8/12 16/5 16/11 16/19
been [3] 5/21 13/3 16/25		
	clarification [1] 24/14	16/24 19/4 19/5 19/19 19/20
before [11] 1/8 2/16 5/5		
9/12 9/16 12/3 13/18 14/10	clarifications [2] 23/25	19/23 20/2 20/17 22/18 22/24
	24/9	date [2] 14/11 25/19
14/11 17/18 21/8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
habale [71 0/4 0/7 0/10 0/11	clarify [3] 19/11 24/3 25/1	Daubert [1] 22/9
behalf [7] 2/4 2/7 2/10 2/11	<pre>clear [2] 7/8 25/8</pre>	day [10] 9/1 10/13 10/14
13/9 18/8 18/13		
	clock [1] 10/8	11/10 11/14 11/16 11/18 14/8
being [5] 3/2 6/2 17/8 18/17	come [4] 15/16 21/4 22/22	14/10 18/21
18/18		
	23/8	days [1] 14/6
believe [2] 16/13 22/15		
besides [1] 17/11	comfortable [4] 15/4 15/20	deadline [2] 10/9 23/10
	15/21 16/10	deals [2] 16/8 16/9
BI [1] 2/10		
big [1] 17/19	coming [1] 7/9	dealt [1] 13/11
	commit [1] 22/7	declined [1] 22/17
bit [3] 12/16 22/14 24/22		
	compared [2] 5/12 11/23	declines [1] 23/21
blockers [1] 5/13	completed [1] 23/19	decreased [2] 20/10 20/11
Boehringer [1] 2/14		
	completely [1] 7/12	DEFENDANTS [9] 1/17 2/10
booked [2] 11/10 18/18	concern [2] 10/11 10/12	2/11 2/11 2/14 4/11 8/1 8/5
bottom [2] 8/8 16/2		
	concession [1] 11/21	23/17
Bradford [1] 20/15	conclude [1] 10/20	Defendants 121 2/16 21/7
break [2] 6/2 12/22	= =	Defendants' [2] 2/16 21/7
	concluded [1] 25/14	Defense [15] 6/22 6/24 7/7
briefing [1] 14/4		
BRUCE [1] 1/8	conclusion [3] 15/16 20/3	10/24 13/11 13/14 13/21 14/3
PROCE [1] 1/0	20/8	19/5 21/18 22/8 22/14 22/22
	1	
C	conclusions [11] 4/4 8/15	23/3 23/23
-	12/14 14/25 15/15 16/3 16/21	defer [1] 9/19
came [1] 6/3		
	17/3 17/15 22/16 22/25	demand [3] 11/7 12/22 18/1
can [13] 10/6 13/25 14/5	conducted [1] 16/17	demands [1] 11/17
15/11 16/1 17/21 17/21 17/24		
	confess [1] 2/20	demonstrate [1] 12/7
22/8 23/3 23/18 24/23 25/8	confirmed [1] 11/8	deny [1] 23/16
can't [4] 6/12 19/15 19/22		_ = = =
	consider [4] 19/19 19/20	depends [1] 3/22
21/2	23/13 23/14	depose [3] 2/17 3/12 23/17
CANAAN [16] 1/17 2/13 2/15		
	considered [5] 6/6 6/15 7/18	deposed [1] 5/21
2/23 3/8 13/11 13/20 14/18	7/20 21/3	
15/3 15/19 16/4 17/10 17/18		deposition [39]
	consistency [1] 20/16	despite [1] 18/18
18/24 18/25 24/20	consistent [2] 13/4 20/17	details [1] 13/7
Canaan's [1] 14/13		
	consonant [1] 16/7	did [12] 2/19 2/21 2/24 3/23
cancer [5] 5/12 6/8 19/19		
19/20 21/1	consulted [1] 12/3	11/21 12/5 13/1 13/16 15/9
	context [1] 14/2	16/13 19/19 19/19
cancer compared [1] 5/12		didn't [6] 2/25 3/2 3/3
cancers [13] 4/3 4/4 6/7	continued [1] 12/19	
	contrary [1] 7/13	11/13 18/1 22/13
6/12 6/14 7/18 8/4 8/13	contrast [1] 5/16	differences [1] 12/13
19/23 20/4 20/5 20/24 22/25		
	convenient [3] 8/24 8/25	different [4] 4/21 4/21
carefully [1] 7/16	11/9	11/23 15/22
carry [1] 11/21	* -	
	correct [7] 6/24 7/3 15/7	direction [1] 15/23
case [4] 1/3 2/1 13/15 23/12	19/4 19/4 19/10 25/16	directly [1] 13/18
causation [13] 6/7 6/11 7/17		
	corrected [2] 16/6 19/5	discovery [6] 1/8 2/3 9/2
7/24 8/3 8/7 8/11 8/11 20/3	correction [11] 6/20 6/23	
20/14 20/16 20/23 21/6		10/9 14/9 23/10
	6/24 12/14 12/23 13/5 13/6	discussed [2] 4/20 6/1
caution [1] 18/15		
certain [1] 22/7	13/12 13/13 13/22 19/3	disingenuous [1] 6/17
	corrections [1] 16/2	disputes [1] 9/5
certainly [2] 5/4 7/22		
certify [1] 25/16	could [14] 4/24 5/1 5/25 6/6	DISTRICT [2] 1/1 1/1
=	6/13 7/16 8/9 10/18 10/21	DIVISION [1] 1/2
chance [4] 2/18 2/21 14/18		
20/19	12/19 12/24 14/2 16/15 25/5	do [12] 8/16 9/11 9/13 9/14
	couldn't [2] 20/1 20/2	12/25 15/5 15/15 15/19 17/12
change [14] 13/17 15/4 15/5		
15/15 16/2 16/19 16/22 17/2	counsel [2] 8/19 11/8	22/15 23/2 25/10
	COURT [8] 1/1 1/21 2/16 9/5	does [6] 9/5 15/4 16/19
17/15 19/17 20/12 20/14 21/5		
	23/9 23/15 23/21 25/21	20/12 20/14 21/4
22/7		
1-1	credibility [2] 17/22 22/10	
	credibility [2] 17/22 22/10	doesn't [5] 4/13 9/17 11/18
changed [7] 14/25 15/1 15/6	criteria [1] 20/16	15/19 19/17
16/6 16/8 16/11 17/4	criteria [1] 20/16	15/19 19/17
16/6 16/8 16/11 17/4	<pre>criteria [1] 20/16 critical [5] 3/12 6/1 19/25</pre>	15/19 19/17 doing [1] 20/15
	criteria [1] 20/16	15/19 19/17
16/6 16/8 16/11 17/4	<pre>criteria [1] 20/16 critical [5] 3/12 6/1 19/25</pre>	15/19 19/17 doing [1] 20/15

D	explore [1] 20/8	get [4] 2/21 7/24 17/21
don't [7] 19/14 21/5	extensive [1] 17/13	21/12
21/16 22/11 22/18 23/7 23/11	extent [10] 9/5 10/21 13/20	getting [1] 3/16
done [4] 5/20 10/18 23/4	16/4 16/23 17/6 17/22 22/5 22/15 22/21	give [4] 14/17 22/14 23/3 24/16
23/5	extra [4] 22/14 23/3 23/17	given [5] 3/15 6/2 6/14
double [2] 11/10 18/18 Dr [58]	25/6	16/25 22/10
due [1] 13/19	extrapolating [1] 4/2	giving [1] 24/5
during [4] 8/18 12/22 25/6	F	go [6] 3/6 4/17 15/8 15/22
25/9		17/18 24/12
	fact [4] 3/2 13/17 15/5	going [24] 2/4 2/9 10/23
E	17/25	11/15 11/25 15/17 16/22 17/2
each [3] 4/20 5/19 8/19	factor [1] 17/1	17/10 18/5 21/9 21/10 21/12
earlier [2] 5/7 9/4	<pre>facts [1] 3/22 fairly [1] 12/23</pre>	21/15 21/16 21/25 22/3 22/14 23/2 23/2 23/3 23/15 24/19
effectively [1] 8/5	fairness [2] 8/22 16/25	24/22
efficient [1] 10/20	false [3] 6/23 13/12 13/22	good [5] 2/8 2/9 2/13 2/15
efforts [1] 8/14	familiar [1] 22/24	25/12
elementary [1] 4/24	familiarize [1] 12/23	grant [4] 14/9 17/11 23/16
eleven [1] 24/4	far [2] 11/20 12/10	23/17
elicit [2] 8/14 21/18	feasible [1] 4/22	granular [1] 24/19
else [4] 15/19 17/17 18/20	Federal [1] 25/20	guess [1] 2/23
24/25	feel [1] 2/21	
<pre>emphasize [1] 20/21 end [1] 18/11</pre>	felt [1] 22/18	<u>H</u>
end [1] 18/11 ends [1] 13/20	few [3] 5/5 5/10 19/1	H2 [1] 5/12
entire [3] 4/6 5/3 14/6	filibuster [1] 21/14	had [16] 2/18 3/7 3/13 6/5
entitled [1] 22/11	final [1] 17/19	6/22 7/9 12/17 13/11 16/16
epidemiologist [5] 4/5 5/7	finally [4] 7/23 8/1 8/23	17/25 18/12 18/14 20/19
5/22 7/1 7/4	21/9	22/12 23/12 25/3
epidemiologist who [1] 7/4		half [2] 18/13 21/10
epidemiology [1] 14/22	findings [1] 4/25	happened [3] 11/14 11/19 16/5
equated [1] 14/7	finish [1] 14/8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
equivalent [1] 21/17	FINKEN [15] 1/10 2/7 11/2 11/5 12/11 13/6 13/8 13/9	happy [3] 3/9 9/8 9/17 has [12] 5/20 6/15 11/16
error [3] 7/3 19/9 19/9	14/19 15/7 17/16 18/8 19/2	12/11 13/3 14/9 15/6 15/16
esophageal [5] 4/3 4/4 6/8	24/7 24/25	16/4 17/6 17/14 23/10
19/19 21/1	first [6] 3/19 6/18 15/13	have [47]
ESQ [3] 1/10 1/14 1/17	19/2 21/25 22/4	haven't [2] 14/21 21/3
estimate [1] 18/10		having [4] 7/18 7/20 15/14
estimates [1] 19/10	8/13 20/4 20/24 22/25	17/20
etc [2] 22/25 22/25 EVA [2] 1/17 2/13	FL [2] 1/5 1/22	he [2] 17/4 18/21
evaluate [1] 17/1	flawed [1] 16/16	hear [4] 3/9 9/10 11/3 18/24
even [7] 4/7 4/22 5/16 5/22	flaws [2] 16/20 16/21	heard [1] 11/22
7/20 15/24 23/10	FLORIDA [1] 1/1	hearing [4] 1/8 2/3 22/9
ever [2] 19/14 23/13	fly [2] 12/16 16/11	25/14
every [6] 3/21 4/5 5/14 6/23	followup [1] 8/22	HEINZ [10] 1/14 2/6 11/2
7/9 8/19	<pre>foregoing [1] 25/16 form [2] 6/4 20/20</pre>	11/4 14/19 15/7 17/17 19/12 24/7 25/2
everybody [1] 25/10	formulate [1] 20/1	help [1] 21/20
everyone [1] 25/12	forward [1] 15/8	her [61]
everything [1] 14/2	founded [1] 23/14	here [6] 2/2 4/19 9/25 14/21
evidence [3] 6/14 20/18 21/1	four [12] 6/7 6/11 6/14 7/18	
exact [1] 5/8	8/4 8/12 9/15 18/2 20/3 20/5	
exactly [2] 14/5 19/10	20/23 22/25	hey [1] 23/9
examination [1] 23/19	framework [2] 14/21 15/8	Hill [1] 20/15
example [2] 5/11 12/17 excuse [1] 25/12	frankly [4] 5/6 8/17 9/19	him [1] 18/19
expand [1] 15/12	13/19	hold [4] 14/17 14/17 14/17
expectation [1] 7/9	Friday [1] 11/15	18/6
expected [1] 21/13	frustrated [2] 3/17 8/14	HON [1] 1/21
expedited [1] 2/17	Ft [1] 1/22	Honor [33]
expert [12] 3/13 3/13 4/14	full [2] 14/1 14/6	HONORABLE [1] 1/8
4/16 5/20 6/24 8/20 9/1 12/6	further [2] 15/12 23/11	hour [7] 8/17 18/12 23/3
13/14 19/5 20/11	G	23/17 24/3 24/4 24/17 hours [17] 3/12 8/2 9/15
experts [5] 5/21 6/22 7/7	GA [1] 1/19	14/7 14/7 18/2 18/5 18/7
13/11 13/21	gastric [1] 4/3	18/11 18/14 18/16 18/23 21/9
explain [1] 22/6	gave [3] 7/25 16/17 17/8	21/10 21/12 21/14 22/12
explicitly [1] 7/2	general [2] 3/20 3/21	how [12] 6/10 6/13 8/10 8/12

		2,9
н	leeway [2] 22/22 23/1	micromanage [1] 24/23
how [8] 14/5 15/17 19/18	Lenkner [1] 1/14	mid [1] 19/3
19/19 20/2 20/3 20/17 20/18	less [1] 10/19	might [2] 9/9 11/5
however [4] 13/25 16/4 16/13	let [4] 15/12 18/24 21/24	minute [1] 6/2
19/4	23/23	minutes [8] 5/5 5/10 17/11
hundred [1] 22/20	let's [2] 21/1 22/24	18/14 24/4 24/5 25/3 25/6
	LIABILITY [2] 1/5 2/2	modified [1] 14/25
I	like [9] 4/2 4/24 5/14 9/21	modify [1] 15/15
I'd [1] 9/8	12/18 15/10 18/1 20/25 23/14 limitations [5] 16/16 16/20	Moorman [6] 5/7 5/13 5/22
IL [1] 1/16	16/21 17/3 17/7	7/2 7/6 19/8
<pre>impeach [1] 17/21</pre>	limited [2] 24/17 25/4	Moorman's [2] 19/6 19/7
importance [1] 3/15	line [4] 2/20 2/20 8/8 16/2	more [14] 3/17 8/10 10/1
important [1] 4/19	literally [5] 5/2 6/23 7/4	10/10 10/12 11/9 12/9 12/11
importantly [2] 8/10 20/23	19/15 20/8	15/20 17/24 18/2 20/22 22/24
inaccurate [1] 6/17 included [1] 11/24	litigation [5] 1/5 2/2 3/13	23/10
included [1] 11/24 including [1] 21/6	5/21 20/4	Moreover [2] 4/19 7/1
inconsistent [1] 22/6	little [4] 12/16 16/18 17/8	most [1] 10/20
increased [2] 20/9 20/11	22/14	motion [9] 2/17 2/18 2/23
increases [1] 5/12	liver [2] 6/8 19/20	2/24 3/16 11/21 11/24 23/16
<pre>indicated [1] 12/13</pre>	LLC [1] 1/14	23/16
indulge [1] 17/10	LLP [1] 1/18 Logan [1] 1/11	move [1] 21/20 Mr [10] 11/2 11/4 11/10
information [1] 8/14	long [1] 17/20	14/19 15/7 17/17 18/18 19/12
Ingelheim [1] 2/14	look [3] 3/7 21/1 22/5	24/7 25/2
inquire [1] 7/23	looking [1] 15/24	Ms [16] 2/15 3/8 11/5 12/11
instead [3] 4/12 7/15 8/25	lot [1] 15/19	14/13 14/18 14/19 15/3 15/7
intend [1] 8/16 intentional [1] 5/23	lumps [1] 4/3	15/18 17/10 17/16 18/24 19/2
interested [1] 3/5	M	24/7 24/25
interpretation [1] 3/24		Ms. [10] 2/23 11/2 13/6 13/8
intervals [1] 16/7	made [4] 12/15 13/13 23/24	13/11 13/20 16/4 17/18 18/25
invitation [1] 23/21	25/11	24/20
is [107]	MAGISTRATE [1] 1/9 make [10] 4/13 7/8 10/17	Ms. Canaan [7] 2/23 13/11 13/20 16/4 17/18 18/25 24/20
issue [3] 8/13 18/17 20/4	11/6 17/23 18/19 21/19 22/8	Ms. Finken [3] 11/2 13/6
issued [1] 19/3	22/11 25/8	13/8
issues [2] 23/25 24/8	makes [3] 6/16 8/4 10/1	much [7] 11/1 12/9 12/13
it [55] it's [1] 24/5	manner [1] 10/23	15/20 18/17 21/23 25/10
itself [2] 13/5 13/6	many [1] 16/16	muddled [1] 11/21
	March [3] 13/13 13/23 19/3	multiple [1] 16/8
J	March 21 [1] 13/13	mutually [2] 8/24 8/25
job [1] 14/10	March 21st [1] 13/23	my [12] 3/25 4/7 4/10 9/17
JUDGE [3] 1/9 22/9 23/12	matter [6] 2/16 8/21 9/17 9/20 17/15 25/17	10/1 19/18 20/7 21/6 21/14 24/8 25/2 25/7
judicial [6] 9/6 10/9 10/15	max [2] 18/10 18/23	24/6 23/2 23/1
10/19 21/20 22/1	may [15] 1/5 5/18 5/18 9/10	N
just [18] 2/10 3/8 4/23 7/12	10/4 10/8 11/8 11/11 14/11	need [10] 4/10 10/9 11/13
11/8 11/22 13/10 13/12 13/21	15/22 18/17 23/20 23/24 24/8	16/15 20/8 21/18 23/9 23/10
13/24 15/24 17/19 18/15 19/13 20/22 23/24 24/2 25/11	25/19	23/25 24/1
17/13 20/22 23/24 24/2 23/11	maybe [4] 15/2 15/13 15/18	needed [4] 6/3 7/15 13/24
K	15/19	22/18
Keller [1] 1/14	McTiernan [42]	needs [2] 16/23 24/20
King [1] 1/18	McTiernan's [6] 3/3 3/17 7/13 8/6 16/3 18/20	nervous [1] 12/16 never [1] 7/25
know [9] 12/12 12/14 12/19	md [1] 1/3	new [2] 8/21 8/22
13/18 13/25 14/19 16/8 18/17	me [17] 2/25 3/1 3/2 5/16	night [1] 11/15
22/11	6/13 9/17 9/20 10/1 15/10	no [13] 1/3 4/17 5/19 8/4
L	15/12 15/13 18/24 19/18	11/17 12/6 13/16 15/18 20/10
lack [1] 8/6	19/22 21/5 21/24 23/23	20/12 21/24 24/2 24/19
lack [1] 8/6	memorializing [1] 25/11	NOAH [4] 1/14 2/6 15/9 24/12
last [5] 9/1 10/13 10/14	mention [1] 7/8	none [1] 11/24
14/8 25/5	mentioned [1] 19/2	nonpersuasive [1] 3/4
late [1] 11/15	methodological [1] 4/1	nonresponsive [1] 8/13
later [1] 17/24	methodologies [1] 22/17	nonresponsiveness [1] 3/18
lawyer [1] 3/1	methodology [7] 3/21 3/24 4/5 4/13 4/25 8/15 22/6	not [65] not without [1] 5/17
least [4] 3/4 5/20 9/21	methodology and [1] 3/21	nothing [1] 20/7
23/13	methods [1] 5/18	noticed [1] 9/1

	T .	
N	4/22 6/1	purportedly [1] 7/6
	PALM [3] 1/2 1/5 1/22	<pre>purpose [3] 3/16 4/14 4/16</pre>
now [15] 2/18 5/4 6/16 6/23		
8/8 8/16 11/22 15/14 15/19	pancreatic [1] 6/8	put [1] 14/2
20/7 20/9 20/19 21/4 22/23	<pre>paper [5] 6/20 7/11 19/3</pre>	
	19/9 20/7	Q
22/23	<pre>part [3] 17/20 23/16 23/16</pre>	question [25] 3/21 4/5 5/6
number [4] 2/1 6/16 17/20	particular [6] 3/22 3/23	5/25 6/10 8/2 8/19 9/12 15/2
18/6		
numerous [1] 4/21	4/25 21/24 22/16 22/17	15/2 15/14 15/17 15/18 15/22
	parties [1] 25/12	15/24 17/12 17/22 18/16
0	parts [1] 4/21	19/22 20/6 22/19 24/12 25/2
	party [1] 23/8	25/3 25/7
o'clock [2] 23/5 23/6	Pauline [2] 1/21 25/20	questioned [1] 5/6
objection [1] 10/7	= =	
objections [2] 23/24 24/8	Peachtree [1] 1/18	questioning [3] 17/13 18/5
observed [1] 3/4	penalize [1] 8/5	18/13
	percent [1] 22/20	questions [51]
obstructionist [1] 3/2	period [1] 25/9	quote [2] 7/21 13/1
obvious [2] 7/2 19/9	person [2] 14/7 14/20	
obviously [3] 5/23 10/3		R
13/25	personally [1] 10/3	
occur [1] 23/20	Philadelphia [1] 1/12	raise [1] 24/1
off [2] 6/13 19/23	phon [2] 12/1 12/2	raised [2] 12/7 20/6
	pick [1] 13/16	RANITIDINE [4] 1/4 2/2 4/20
official [3] 1/21 19/2 25/20	picked [1] 13/19	5/12
oh [1] 7/11	piece [1] 19/25	rarest [1] 22/2
Okay [5] 9/24 10/3 13/8		
21/24 24/6	Pierce [1] 1/22	rationale [1] 24/14
one [18] 1/11 3/5 4/17 4/18	place [2] 9/4 9/6	RE [2] 1/4 2/1
10/4 13/10 17/8 17/19 20/15	Plaintiff [1] 2/6	reach [1] 4/3
	PLAINTIFFS [17] 1/10 2/5 2/7	reached [3] 6/11 8/11 20/3
21/10 22/2 23/3 23/11 23/17		reaching [1] 20/18
24/3 24/4 24/11 24/14	8/23 9/12 11/2 13/9 18/9	read [7] 2/19 2/24 4/15 7/6
ones [1] 3/4		
online [1] 13/13	21/9 23/4 23/19	14/1 14/21 18/2
only [8] 5/10 7/4 7/8 9/17		reading [2] 4/6 21/14
11/16 11/22 20/13 21/18	5/6 5/19 5/20 5/22 6/16 7/1	real [1] 23/22
	8/18 10/22 18/4	really [14] 3/17 3/22 4/13
opinion [10] 4/8 6/11 7/20	Plaza [1] 1/15	4/19 9/16 9/20 10/10 10/14
7/23 8/12 20/1 20/7 20/12	please [1] 2/5	10/21 12/9 20/21 20/22 21/7
20/18 21/18		
opinions [8] 6/4 8/9 8/21	plus [1] 23/12	21/20
9/22 15/5 20/20 20/23 21/8		reason [5] 10/13 11/17 21/19
opportunity [5] 9/4 12/1	12/7 13/10 13/10 13/24 14/12	23/7 23/8
	17/19 17/23 18/13 21/11	reasons [1] 13/3
17/1 17/25 20/10	21/19	rebuttal [1] 13/18
opposing [1] 11/8	pointed [1] 17/14	recall [1] 21/16
opposition [5] 2/19 4/11		
6/16 6/21 13/2	points [1] 16/24	reconvened [1] 8/24
order [4] 21/24 23/2 23/15	portions [1] 4/15	record [8] 4/16 8/9 8/23
	position [2] 10/25 13/4	14/7 16/14 17/6 18/11 25/17
25/11	positions [1] 22/7	redirect [8] 8/17 8/18 9/13
other [17] 5/7 5/12 5/19	potentially [1] 10/18	9/22 10/2 21/11 23/4 23/19
5/22 6/10 7/1 7/7 9/11 11/12	precedent [1] 14/10	refer [1] 12/1
11/17 11/19 11/23 11/25 13/1	1-	
18/21 23/25 24/8	preference [1] 11/11	reference [1] 16/14
our [2] 11/10 18/13	prejudicing [1] 21/7	refused [2] 12/4 23/13
out [15] 7/18 8/4 8/13 9/22	preliminary [1] 3/8	regarding [1] 17/7
10/8 13/10 13/24 14/13 17/4	preparation [1] 8/6	regardless [1] 16/18
	<pre>preparing [1] 14/23</pre>	REINHART [1] 1/8
17/14 17/21 20/4 20/24 21/8	preprint [1] 19/4	related [1] 24/15
23/10	presence [1] 10/15	relative [1] 16/7
over [6] 12/3 12/4 13/6		
21/25 22/3 23/22	present [1] 10/21	relevant [1] 5/10
overall [16] 6/7 6/11 6/14	<pre>preside [3] 21/25 22/3 23/21</pre>	
7/17 7/24 8/3 8/7 8/11 8/11	press [1] 12/21	relief [1] 10/9
	primarily [1] 3/5	relying [3] 4/8 4/9 4/24
19/19 19/20 19/22 20/3 20/14	prior [1] 13/22	reopen [1] 23/9
20/23 21/1	probably [5] 3/19 9/15 10/1	report [18] 4/6 4/10 4/12
oversight [4] 9/6 10/19		<u> </u>
21/20 22/1	10/18 12/19	4/15 6/1 7/2 8/20 12/3 12/21
	problem [1] 5/9	13/4 13/18 14/23 15/16 16/3
P	proceedings [1] 25/17	17/5 19/6 19/7 21/4
	Product [1] 2/2	Reporter [3] 1/21 25/20
p.m [1] 23/21	PRODUCTS [1] 1/5	25/21
PA [1] 1/12	proffer [1] 8/9	reports [11] 3/14 3/25 4/21
<pre>page [2] 6/21 8/20</pre>	provide [1] 8/21	7/6 13/14 13/19 13/21 13/22
pages [5] 2/20 3/14 4/20		
	<pre>provided [2] 14/1 14/3</pre>	14/24 19/5 21/15

R	seems [1] 24/20	subbing [1] 18/20
represent [1] 7/22	seen [1] 3/19	subject [1] 24/18
representations [1] 14/13	served [2] 13/14 13/22	submitt [2] 4/1/ 3/23 submitted [2] 3/13 14/24
request [3] 9/3 9/11 23/13	set [2] 10/7 18/16	substantial [1] 12/13
require [1] 11/17	setting [1] 23/11	sufficiently [1] 11/21
requires [1] 23/11	she [81]	suggested [1] 13/11
rereading [1] 5/14 rescheduling [1] 11/18	short [1] 21/2	Suite [3] 1/12 1/15 1/18
reserve [1] 22/13	should [10] 4/5 4/12 8/1	supplement [1] 16/15
reserved [4] 8/2 17/12 18/14	8/22 16/25 17/13 22/1 22/10	suppose [1] 13/5
22/1	22/22 23/1 shouldn't [2] 18/1 20/10	<pre>sure [2] 4/9 22/20 surprise [1] 13/16</pre>
resonate [2] 3/1 3/2	show [1] 3/23	synthesized [1] 8/12
resonated [1] 2/25	showed [1] 19/7	
respect [2] 6/17 8/6 respectfully [1] 9/3	side [2] 9/11 18/4	T
respond [4] 14/18 15/9 15/11	Signature [1] 25/21	table [3] 6/13 15/2 19/24
16/1	significant [1] 5/17	tables [3] 16/6 16/12 16/19
response [3] 3/21 3/24 4/9	significantly [1] 21/7 Similarly [1] 4/7	tail [1] 18/11 take [10] 3/6 5/5 9/4 9/6
responsibilities [1] 14/9	simply [3] 6/23 10/8 11/11	10/5 13/25 14/10 18/19 18/21
responsive [4] 8/21 10/23	since [1] 11/10	21/24
21/13 21/15	single [2] 5/14 6/23	taken [1] 23/18
responsiveness [1] 11/20 results [1] 3/24	sit [1] 4/15	taking [6] 4/18 5/10 10/4
review [13] 2/18 2/21 4/23	slated [1] 18/21	10/14 15/13 22/6
5/5 5/10 6/2 6/3 7/16 8/19	smoother [1]	talk [3] 3/9 11/25 22/24
17/1 20/19 22/18 23/11	9/14 11/15 11/15 13/24 14/2	talking [2] 3/5 20/13 team [2] 9/11 11/3
reviewed [4] 14/23 15/14	14/12 16/10 16/16 16/16	tee [1] 9/4
20/9 22/23	18/22 19/10 19/25 20/21	TELEPHONIC [1] 1/8
reviewing [3] 5/2 5/18 12/5 right [9] 7/14 7/23 12/16	21/17 22/3 22/14	tell [4] 2/25 5/16 6/12 6/13
14/20 15/25 20/12 24/3 24/4	some [19] 3/8 5/8 7/24 9/10	tentatively [1] 12/8
25/10	9/16 9/16 9/21 10/9 10/15	testified [6] 5/15 6/5 7/5
risk [6] 5/12 19/10 20/10	11/5 12/10 13/6 15/20 17/7 22/18 22/22 23/1 23/7 23/8	17/6 19/12 19/14 testimony [4] 3/15 7/13 8/22
20/11 20/11 20/12	somebody [1] 18/20	18/20
risks [3] 16/7 20/9 20/10 Riverside [1] 1/15	somehow [1] 19/12	than [1] 11/9
ROBIN [1] 1/21	someone [1] 10/21	thank [14] 3/10 10/25 14/14
Ronca [2] 11/10 18/18	something [6] 5/5 12/17 15/1 16/25 17/4 24/25	14/15 1//16 18/4 18/24 19/1 21/22 21/23 24/6 24/24 25/10
ROSENBERG [4] 1/3 1/21 22/9	10/23 1//4 24/23 Sorry [1] 24/12	25/11
23/13	sort [1] 11/20	that [178]
routinely [1] 12/3 rule [1] 24/1	SOUTHERN [1] 1/1	their [11] 4/6 6/21 9/13
rulings [3] 23/24 24/8 25/11	Spalding [1] 1/18	10/2 12/3 13/21 13/22 18/14
run [4] 10/8 10/8 10/17	<pre>speak [2] 2/4 11/4 specific [13] 4/2 4/2 4/8</pre>	21/15 23/4 23/19 them [7] 4/15 5/9 11/9 17/9
23/10	5/2 5/19 9/9 12/4 16/5 16/11	
S	16/23 16/24 18/6 19/23	then [11] 4/17 12/11 12/18
said [17] 3/25 5/19 6/3 7/2	specifically [2] 4/4 19/8	15/18 15/22 18/2 19/9 19/18
7/14 7/15 8/16 12/17 13/2	speed [1] 21/21	20/6 24/21 24/22
13/20 19/8 19/12 19/15 19/17	spend [1] 21/14	there [21] 4/15 5/20 9/6 10/15 10/19 11/13 11/17 12/9
19/22 21/2 21/9	Square [1] 1/11 stand [1] 16/20	10/13 10/19 11/13 11/17 12/9 12/13 12/16 12/20 13/17 16/8
same [5] 5/8 5/11 10/23 18/3	stands [1] 8/9	17/17 19/4 19/8 22/21 23/1
25/3 sat [1] 14/6	start [2] 11/7 23/5	23/1 23/8 23/24
saw [1] 12/18	state [2] 6/21 16/13	thereafter [1] 23/8
say [10] 4/3 7/11 12/9 12/10	stated [2] 3/16 8/23	Thereupon [1] 25/14 these [6] 4/1 7/10 14/22
12/11 21/4 21/14 21/16 22/23	statement [1] 13/12 STATES [2] 1/1 1/9	17/7 17/7 21/24
23/9	statistically [1] 5/17	they [18] 6/18 8/16 8/25
<pre>saying [1] 7/15 scheduling [1] 11/7</pre>	still [1] 18/19	12/2 12/19 16/6 16/6 17/11
scope [2] 24/18 25/4	Stipes [2] 1/21 25/20	17/22 17/23 17/24 17/25 18/1
second [3] 3/7 9/10 22/5	stomach [1] 6/8 stonewalling [1] 5/23	18/14 21/12 22/10 22/11 23/3 thing [2] 12/24 13/1
Secondly [2] 5/1 7/11	Street [2] 1/12 1/18	things [7] 12/24 13/1 things [7] 11/14 12/10 17/21
section [1] 13/1	studies [8] 3/23 5/2 5/2 5/3	
see [3] 4/10 10/21 14/5 seeking [1] 24/9	12/4 12/5 14/22 17/8	think [13] 9/14 9/21 10/17
seem [1] 15/13	study [61]	10/18 10/19 11/5 18/11 18/22
	sub [1] 16/9	19/14 21/19 22/1 23/1 23/12

	1	
T	up [5] 9/5 10/8 10/10 13/16	
thinking [1] 9/25	13/19	12/24 17/22
third [2] 5/24 11/14	upon [2] 14/1 15/5	witnesses [1] 11/25
this [43]		wonderful [1] 22/8
thoroughly [1] 17/1	use [1] 23/4	word [2] 4/15 4/16
those [12] 3/8 5/14 6/11	used [1] 17/21	words [1] 6/10
19/21 20/4 21/2 22/8 22/12	v	working [2] 15/8 18/22
22/21 24/21 24/21 25/6	<u>v</u>	would [37]
though [1] 23/10	various [1] 13/3	wouldn't [1] 22/19
thought [4] 7/13 17/4 19/16	version [2] 12/18 20/9	writing [1] 14/9
24/1	very [15] 5/23 6/16 9/1	written [1] 14/24
thoughts [1] 3/8		wrong [1] 7/5
through [1] 4/17	16/17 16/23 17/8 21/23 23/11	wrote [2] 4/10 4/23
time [18] 2/17 3/15 3/17	24/20 25/10	Y
8/25 10/10 10/19 11/15 11/17	T. T.	
17/11 18/13 20/8 21/17 22/13		years [1] 23/12
22/15 23/10 23/18 23/22 25/3	waiving [2] 23/23 24/7	yes [3] 10/6 10/12 15/22
times [1] 11/12	want [12] 3/9 7/8 9/12 11/7	yet [1] 6/5
to preside [1] 23/21	13/10 13/25 15/9 15/15 17/23	
today [4] 2/3 2/12 7/20	20/21 22/11 22/19	you [75]
23/15	wanted [6] 3/6 14/12 17/17	your [45]
too [1] 18/17	19/10 24/2 25/1	Z
topic [2] 3/9 18/3	wants [2] 25/6 25/9	
totaling [2] 3/14 4/22	was [51]	ZANTAC [2] 1/4 2/2
totality [1] 8/12	wasn't [5] 11/10 12/20 15/4	
totally [2] 6/18 7/12	15/21 22/20	
TRACY [4] 1/10 2/7 13/9 18/8	way [7] 10/20 12/6 12/15	
transcript [3] 14/1 14/2	12/19 15/25 16/17 23/4	
25/16	we [44]	
transcripts [2] 11/23 14/3	week [1] 5/7	
trial [1] 21/8	weekend [1] 25/12	
Trodocker's [1] 12/2	weighed [2] 6/13 20/2	
trouble [1] 4/18	weighing [1] 20/18 weight [2] 16/18 17/8	
true [1] 19/13	Weiss [1] 1/11	
trying [2] 18/18 21/19	well [10] 2/19 13/4 13/5	
turn [2] 13/6 23/23	13/14 13/17 17/4 20/6 20/17	
two [13] 3/11 3/13 4/21 8/16	23/14 24/13	
14/6 18/5 18/7 18/11 18/16	were [15] 4/1 5/13 5/20 6/8	
18/23 21/9 21/12 23/12	11/15 12/6 12/12 12/13 13/14	
type [1] 12/24	13/19 13/22 14/3 14/24 16/8	
Ū	22/21	
	WEST [3] 1/2 1/5 1/22	
ultimate [1] 17/2	what [18] 2/25 2/25 4/9 4/10	
ultimately [1] 16/13	4/19 4/23 4/25 5/18 9/14	
unable [2] 22/6 25/5	9/22 10/21 11/19 12/5 16/5	
unavailable [1] 14/10	18/10 20/6 21/8 23/2	
under [2] 15/8 20/15 underlying [1] 15/6	whatever [5] 3/9 3/25 21/10	
underlying [1] 13/6 understand [3] 10/25 14/3	25/6 25/8	
14/21	when [8] 3/22 9/19 9/22 16/5	
understandable [1] 6/19	20/11 20/25 22/2 22/12	
understandably [1] 12/15	where [2] 19/8 20/15	
understood [1] 24/15	whether [3] 4/8 4/24 5/11	
unilateral [1] 10/7	which [11] 2/18 3/6 6/1	
unilaterally [1] 8/25	10/23 11/24 12/2 13/2 14/7	
uninformative [7] 7/12 7/14	17/19 17/20 23/3	
7/22 13/3 19/13 19/15 19/17	Whitty's [1] 12/1	
unique [1] 23/11	who [7] 2/4 2/4 2/9 2/11 7/4	
UNITED [2] 1/1 1/9	10/21 14/20	
unobjectionable [1] 22/16	whole [1] 15/19	
unprepared [1] 3/4	why [5] 18/16 20/11 20/12	
unquote [1] 7/21	20/14 22/9	
unreasonable [2] 5/4 12/24	will [28]	
unsealed [1] 2/18	willing [1] 14/8	
until [2] 13/13 13/19	wish [1] 25/12	
unusual [1] 12/6	without [7] 4/6 5/2 5/9 5/14	
unwilling [1] 22/7	5/17 7/18 12/5	
	without literally [1] 5/2	
	<u></u>	<u> </u>